

REMARKS

Pending claims 1-18 have been examined and are rejected. Specifically, the Examiner maintains the rejection of claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Britton et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,442,577 (hereinafter "Britton"). Additionally, the Examiner maintains the rejection of claims 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Britton in view of Yoon et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,173,407 (hereinafter "Yoon"). Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of claims 1-18 for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for facilitating the creation and manipulation of compilations of content by a user (*see also* claims 6 and 11). The Examiner's position is that Britton discloses that users of an ISP or ICP node create and manipulate compilations of content (*see* Office Action, page 5). According to the Examiner, the ISP and ICP nodes include a computer, which includes a monitor 212 (Britton: col. 5, lines 43-46; and Fig. 2). The Examiner alleges that this monitor corresponds to the "user interface" between the users in that node with the data repository (*see* Office Action, pages 5-6). The Examiner further alleges that the person in the ISP or ICP node must use this monitor as an interface or a layer between him/her and the data repository to create the web page for the end users. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In Britton, an Internet Content Provider (ICP) dynamically forms customized web pages for participating ISPs and organizations (Britton: Abstract). In Britton, the information and its arrangement for a participant's web page is predetermined and stored at the ICP (Britton: col. 7,

lines 33-36; Figs. 3, 4 and 7). If the computer system illustrated in Fig. 2 of Britton is used as an ICP node, it serves functions relating to the ICP node, *e.g.*, storing identification information for those participating ISPs and organizations requiring customized web pages (Britton: col. 6, lines 16-31), as well as storing the file information for these ISPs and organizations (Britton: col. 6, lines 32-46).

Contrary to the Examiner's allegations, in Britton, an ICP node (*e.g.*, 112.1) does not correspond to the step of "providing a functional layer for interfacing over a network with the user via a user interface and interfacing with a data repository containing a plurality of content entities", as recited in claim 1 (*see also* claims 6 and 11). Nor does the monitor 212 of the computer system 200 of Britton, when the computer system 200 is used as a hardware platform for an ICP node, correspond to the "user interface" recited in claim 1 (*see also* claims 6 and 11).

For example, in claim 1, a functional layer interfaces with a user via the user interface and with a data repository over a network (*see also* claims 6 and 11). Conversely, in Britton, as noted above, the ICP node stores page files containing standard web site material for the ICP, stores IP addresses for all participating ISPs and organization nodes and stores the names and locations of the files to be included in the page files designed for the ICP node (Britton: col. 7, lines 28-36). A user of the ICP uses the computer system 200 of the ICP node to perform these functions of the ICP node (*e.g.*, storing the aforementioned data on hard disk 208) over a local bus 201 and not over a network 110 (Britton: col. 7, lines 25-27; and Fig. 2). Thus, the ICP node of Britton does not correspond to the functional layer recited in claim 1 (*see also* claims 6 and 11).

Further still, in Britton, users of an ISP or an organization node do not create or manipulate compilations of content selected by the users. To the contrary, an application of the ICP node dynamically forms and provides customized web pages to participants in order to attract/increase traffic flow (Britton: Abstract; and col. 7, lines 25-27). Thus, in Britton, the information used in dynamically generating the web page has been pre-defined and previously stored in participant file database 400 at the ICP node, such that no user (*i.e.*, participating ISP or organization node) involvement, beyond providing a service request (*i.e.*, web access), occurs in dynamically generating the web page (Britton: col. 6, lines 32-55; col. 7, lines 51-55; and Figs. 3-4 and 7). Consequently, Britton fails to disclose or suggest providing a functional layer for interfacing a user and a data repository over a network in order for the user to select content entities from the data repository for creating/manipulating a compilation of content (*see* claims 1, 6 and 11).

For at least the above exemplary reasons, claims 1, 6 and 11 are not anticipated by Britton. Consequently, claims 2-5, 7-10 and 12-15 are not anticipated by Britton at least by virtue of their dependency, as well as the additional features recited therein.

Additionally, because Yoon fails to cure the exemplary deficiencies noted above with respect to Britton, claims 16-18 are patentable over a reasonable combination, if any, of Britton and Yoon at least by virtue of their dependency.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Application No. 09/489,605
Attorney Docket No. A8514 / STL000023US1

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Billy Carter Raulerson
Registration No. 52,156

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 17, 2003